REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-43 remain in the case.

Claims 1, 34, 41 and 42 have been amended to replace the "exposing" terminology with "applying." Basis is found at page 13, l. 19-29, page 14, l. 5, 7 and 20 and page 15, l. 5. Claim 1 has further been amended to remove the merely laudatory term "improved." Claims 13, 14 and 33 have also been amended to employ the "applying" language. Claim 15 has been amended to employ proper Markush Terminology. Claim 11 has been amended to recite the omitted term "or." Basis is at page 12, l. 24 and page 13, l. 20-24. Claim 34 has been amended to remove the "and/or" expression. It is submitted that all amendments are fully supported, and entry is requested.

Claim Objections

It is submitted that the foregoing amendments meet all objections to Claims 11, 15 and 34, at page 2 of the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are requested.

Rejection Under 35 USC 112

It is submitted that removal of the term "improved" from Claim 1 fully meets the rejection of that claim at p. 2-3 of the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Penn Yan Boats Case

The Examiner's comments at page 2 of the Office Action have been duly noted.

Subsequent to the *Penn Yan Boats, Inc. v. Sea Lark Boats Inc., et al.* [175 USPQ 260 (DC S. Fla. 1972)], the USPTO, in concert with the Legislative Branch and with consultation from the user population, devised an appropriate method for calling pertinent prior art to the attention to the USPTO, i.e., the Information Disclosure Statement ("IDS"). As part of the IDS procedure, 37 C.F.R. 197 (h) specifies that the IDS does not constitute an admission that the cited documents are, or are considered to be, material to the patent application.

Accordingly, and *Penn Yan Boats* notwithstanding, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants have fully met the USPTO requirements regarding the proper manner of submission of documents for consideration by the Examiner, and that no further commentary regarding the pertinence of the cited documents is required.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

All claims stand rejected over U.S. 5,057,240, for reasons of record at pages 3-6 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections, to the extent they may apply to the claims, as amended herewith.

To summarize the Examiner's position, it would appear that the Examiner is combining those parts of the '240 which relate to a typical drying process in a heated clothes dryer to, assertedly, arrive at the present invention. According to the Examiner's interpretation, this would presumably be due to the generation of vapors during the drying operation. Thus, under this interpretation, the fabrics would be "exposed" to said vapors during a conventional heat-assisted drying operation.

The claims herein have now been amended to recite the term "applying", as contrasted with the term "exposing", with respect to both the aqueous vapor and the lipophilic fluid.

It is submitted that the invention as now claimed is the exact opposite of the process of '240. Thus, while the drying step '240 involves removing materials from fabrics, said materials being in the vapor phase, the present invention requires applying an aqueous vapor and applying a lipophilic fluid to the fabrics. This, it is submitted, is nowhere suggested in '240, nor is it an inherent feature thereof.

Moreover, it is submitted that the Examiner's comments regarding "pulsing" are unsupported on the record. Nothing is '240 teaches or suggests the pulsed removal of vaporous materials from fabrics, much less the pulsed application of water vapor thereto.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, early and favorable action in the case is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Deak et al

By _____
Jerry J. Yetter
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 26,598
(513) 627-1907

June 16, 2004
Customer No. 27752
(8325 Response OA 3-30-04)
Revised 10/14/2003